arXiv:1510.01571v3 [math.CV] 31 Oct 2015

ESTIMATES OF THE KOBAYASHI AND QUASI-HYPERBOLIC DISTANCES

NIKOLAI NIKOLOV AND LYUBOMIR ANDREEV

Abstract. Universal upper bounds for the Kobayashi and quasi-hyperbolic distances near Dini-smooth boundary points of domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$, respectively, are obtained.

1. Introduction and results

Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The Kobayashi (pseudo)distance k_D is the largest (pseudo)distance not exceeding the Lempert function

$$l_D(z,w)=\inf\{\tanh^{-1}|\alpha| : \exists\varphi\in\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D},D) \text{ with } \varphi(0)=z,\varphi(\alpha)=w\},$$

where $\mathbb{D}$ is the unit disc. Note that k_D is the integrated form of the Kobayashi (pseudo)metric

$$\kappa_D(z;X)=\inf\{|\alpha| : \exists\varphi\in\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D},D) \text{ with } \varphi(0)=z,\alpha\varphi'(0)=X\}.$$

We also point out that $k_D=l_D$ for any domain D in $\mathbb{C}$.

Various estimates of invariant distances and metrics play crucial role in many questions in complex analysis.

Set $d_D(z)=\operatorname{dist}(z,\partial D)$. Recall the following upper bound for k_D.

Proposition 1. [2, Proposition 2.5] *Let a be a $\mathcal{C}^{1+\varepsilon}$-smooth boundary point of a domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then there exist a neighborhood U of a and a constant $c>0$ such that for $z,w\in D\cap U$,*

$$2k_D(z,w)<\log\left(1+\frac{|z-w|}{d_D(z)}\right)+\log\left(1+\frac{|z-w|}{d_D(w)}\right)+c.$$

This easily implies the next corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let D be a $\mathcal{C}^{1+\varepsilon}$-smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then there exists a constant $c>0$ such that*

$$2k_D(z,w)<\log\left(1+\frac{|z-w|}{d_D(z)}\right)+\log\left(1+\frac{|z-w|}{d_D(w)}\right)+c.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32F45, 51M10.

Key words and phrases. Kobayashi distance, quasi-hyperbolic distance.

L. Andreev is partially supported by the Bulgarian national science found under contract DFNI-I 02/14.

The following weaker inequality holds for l_D.

Proposition 3. [6, Theorem 1] *Let D be a $\mathcal{C}^{1+\varepsilon}$-smooth bounded domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then there exists a constant $c>0$ such that*

$$2l_D(z,w) < -\log d_D(z) - \log d_D(w) + c.$$

Note that C^1-smoothness is not enough for the last two inequalities.

Example 4. [6, Example 2] *The image of $\mathbb{D}$ under the (univalent) map $z \mapsto 2z + (1-z)\log(1-z)$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth bounded domain D for which*

$$\lim_{\mathbb{R}\ni z\uparrow 2}(2k_D(z,0) + \log d_D(z)) = +\infty.$$

Recall now that the simple inequality $\kappa_D(z;X) \le \dfrac{|X|}{d_D(z)}$ shows that the Kobayashi distance does not exceed the quasi-hyperbolic distance

$$h_D(z,w) = \inf_\gamma \int_\gamma \frac{|du|}{d_D(u)},$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable curves γ in D joining z to w (by [4, Lemma 1], the infimimum is attained). The definition of h_D in the real case is the same. This distance arises in the the theory of quasi-conformal maps.

We have more if $\mathcal{C}^1$-smoothness is required (despite Example 4).

Proposition 5. *(a) If a is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth boundary point of a domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$, then*

$$\limsup_{\substack{z,w\to a\\ z\ne w}} \frac{k_D(z,w)}{h_D(z,w)} \le \frac{1}{2}.$$

(b) If D is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$, then

$$\limsup_{z\to\partial D} \frac{k_D(z,w)}{h_D(z,w)} \le \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{uniformly in } w\ne z.$$

Set $s_D(z,w) = 2\sinh^{-1}\dfrac{|z-w|}{2\sqrt{d_D(z)d_D(w)}}$. Note that $h_D = s_D$ if D is a half-space in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (cf. [8, (2.8)]).

Proposition 6. *(a) If a is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth boundary point of a domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$\lim_{\substack{z,w\to a\\ z\ne w}} \frac{h_D(z,w)}{s_D(z,w)} = 1.$$

(b) If D is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\lim_{z\to\partial D} \frac{h_D(z,w)}{s_D(z,w)} = 1 \quad \text{uniformly in } w\ne z.$$

Let $q_D(z,w) = \dfrac{h_D(z,w)}{s_D(z,w)}$ if $z, w \in D$, $z \neq w$, and $q_D(z,w) = 1$ otherwise. Since $\lim\limits_{\substack{z,w\to u\\ z\neq w}} q_D(z,w) = 1$ for any $u \in D$, Proposition 6 (b) means that q_D is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Our main purpose is, refining the proof of Proposition 1, to extend this proposition in two directions. First, we put the constant $c > 0$ in front of the factor $|z-w|$ which agrees to the case $z = w$. Moreover, we choose c to be universal. Second, we replace the $\mathcal{C}^{1+\varepsilon}$-smoothness by the weaker assumption of Dini-smoothness.

Recall that a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth boundary point a of a domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is said to be Dini smooth (or Lyapunov-Dini smooth) if the inner unit normal vector n to ∂D near a is a Dini-continuous function. This means that there exists a neighborhood U of a such that $\displaystyle\int_0^1 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt < +\infty$, where

$$\omega(t) = \omega(n, \partial D \cap U, t) := \sup\{|n_x - n_y| : |x-y| < t,\ x, y \in \partial D \cap U\}$$

is the respective modulus of continuity.

For $c > 0$ set

$$v_D^c(z,w) = 2\log\left(1 + \frac{c|z-w|}{\sqrt{d_D(z)d_D(w)}}\right).$$

By [1, Theorem 1.1], v_D^c is a distance if $c \geq 2$. Let $c_0 = 1 + \dfrac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$.

Theorem 7. *Let a be a Dini-smooth boundary point of a domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$, resp. $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for any constant $c > c_0$ there exists a neighborhood U of a such that on $(D \cap U)^2$,*

$$2k_D \leq v_D^c, \ \textit{resp.}\ h_D \leq v_D^c.$$

Corollary 8. *Let D be a Dini-smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$, resp. $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a constant $c > c_0$ such that*

$$2k_D \leq v_D^c, \ \textit{resp.}\ h_D \leq v_D^c.$$

Note now that h_D has a minorant i_D for which $v_D^{1/2} \leq i_D \leq s_D \leq v_D^1$.

Proposition 9. [3, Lemma 2.6] *If D is a proper subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$h_D(z,w) \geq i_D(z,w) := 2\log\frac{d_D(z) + d_D(w) + |z-w|}{2\sqrt{d_D(z)d_D(w)}}.$$

Observe that $h_D = i_D$ if $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ (then D is an open interval or ray).

The next corollary is a consequence of Theorem 7, Corollary 8 and Proposition 9.

Corollary 10. *If a is a Dini-smooth boundary point of a domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$, then*

$$\limsup_{z,w\to a}(2k_D(z,w)-h_D(z,w))\le 2\log(2+\sqrt{2}).$$

Therefore, if D is a Dini-smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$, then the function $2k_D-h_D$ is bounded from above.

The next proposition shows that i_D is a distance. Then the equality $\lim\limits_{\substack{z,w\to u\\ z\ne w}}\dfrac{i_D(z,w)}{|z-w|}=\dfrac{1}{d_D(u)}$ implies that h_D is the intrinsic distance of i_D; in particular, $h_D\ge i_D$.

Proposition 11. *If X is a metric space and $f:X\to\mathbb{R}^+$ is an 1-Lipschitz function, then $\rho(z,w)=\log\dfrac{f(z)+f(w)+|z-w|}{2\sqrt{f(z)f(w)}}$ is a distance.*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the proof of Propositions 5, 6 and 11. Section 3 contains the proof of Theorem 7. Section 4 is devoted to an application of Corollary 8 to boundary continuity of proper holomorphic maps.

2. Proofs of Propositions 5, 6 and 11

Proof of Proposition 5. We shall use that if $a\in\partial D$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth, then (cf. [5, (2)])

$$\limsup_{z\to a}\max_{|X|=1}\kappa_D(z;X)d_D(z)\le\frac{1}{2}. \tag{1}$$

First, we shall prove (b). By (1), for any $c>1/2$ there exists a neighborhood U of ∂D such that

$$2\kappa_D(z;X)d_D(z)\le c|X|,\quad z\in D\cap U.$$

Consider a geodesic γ of h_D joining $z\in D\cap U$ and $w\in D$. If $\gamma\in U$, then $k_D(z,w)\le ch_D(z,w)$. Otherwise, let u and v be the first and the last points, where γ meets ∂U (possible $u=v$). Then

$$k_D(z,w)\le ch_D(z,w)+k_D(u,v).$$

Since $\lim\limits_{z\to\partial D}\inf\limits_{u\in D\setminus U}h_D(z,u)=+\infty$ by Proposition 9, it follows that

$$\limsup_{z\to\partial D}\frac{k_D(z,w)}{h_D(z,w)}\le c\quad\text{uniformly in } w\ne z.$$

It remains to let $c\to 1/2$.

The proof of (a) is the same, choosing a respective neighborhood U of a.

Proof of Proposition 6. (a) After translation and rotation, we may assume that $a = 0$ and that there is a neighborhood U of 0 such that

$$D' := D \cap U = \{x \in U : r(x) := x_1 + f(x') > 0\},$$

where f is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-smooth function in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $f(0) = 0$ and $\nabla f(0) = 0$.

Let $c > 1$ and $\theta(x) = (r(x), x')$. We may shrink U such that

$$c^{-1}|x - y| \le |\theta(x) - \theta(y)| \le c|x - y|, \quad x, y \in U. \tag{2}$$

Choose now a neighborhood $V \subset U$ of 0 such that $d_{D'} = d_D$ on $D \cap V$. Using, for example, [4, Theorem 2], one can find a neighborhood $W \subset V$ of 0 such that any geodesic for $h_D(z, w)$ belongs to $D \cap V$ if $z, w \in \tilde{D} = D \cap W$. Then $h_D = h_{D'}$ on $\tilde{D}^2$.

Set $\Pi = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 > 0\}$ and $\Pi' = \theta(D')$. Using the above arguments, we may shrink W such that $h_\Pi = h_{\Pi'}$ on $(\theta(\tilde{D}))^2$.

On the other hand, (2) implies that (cf. [8, Exercise 3.17])

$$c^{-2} h_{D'}(z, w) \le h_{\Pi'}(\theta(z), \theta(w)) \le c^2 h_{D'}(z, w), \quad z, w \in D'.$$

Let $z, w \in \tilde{D}$. Then

$$c^{-2} h_D(z, w) \le h_\Pi(\theta(z), \theta(w)) \le c^2 h_D(z, w).$$

Using (2) again, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} h_\Pi(\theta(z), \theta(w)) &= 2 \sinh^{-1} \frac{|\theta(z) - \theta(w)|}{2\sqrt{r_D(z) r_D(w)}} \\ &\le 2 \sinh^{-1} \frac{c^2 |z - w|}{2\sqrt{d_D(z) d_D(w)}} \le c^2 s_D(z, w). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain in the same way that

$$h_\Pi(\theta(z), \theta(w)) \ge c^{-2} s_D(z, w).$$

So

$$c^{-4} h_D(z, w) \le s_D(z, w) \le c^4 h_D(z, w)$$

which implies the desired result.

(b) It is an easy consequence of (a) and we omit the details.

Proof of Proposition 11. $\rho(z, u) + \rho(u, w) \ge \rho(z, w) \Leftrightarrow$

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{f(z) + f(u) + |z - u|}{2\sqrt{f(z) f(u)}} \cdot \frac{f(u) + f(w) + |u - w|}{2\sqrt{f(u) f(w)}} \ge \frac{f(z) + f(w) + |z - w|}{2\sqrt{f(z) f(w)}} \\ \Leftrightarrow (f(z) + f(u) + |z - u|)(f(u) + f(w) + |u - w|) \\ \ge 2f(u)(f(z) + f(w) + |z - w|) \\ \Leftrightarrow (f(z) - f(u) + |z - u|)(f(w) - f(u) + |w - u|) \\ +2f(u)(|z - u| + |u - w| - |z - w|) \ge 0. \end{gathered}$$

The last inequality holds, since all factors are nonnegative.

3. Proof of Theorem 7

First, we shall prove the result for k_D.

We may find a neighborhood V of a and a number $s>0$ such that:
– $\omega=\omega(n,\partial D\cap V,\cdot)$ is a Dini-continuous function;
– if $b\in\partial D\cap V$ and $\phi_b(\tau)=b+\tau n_b$ ($\tau\in\mathbb{C}$), then $\phi_b(3s\mathbb{D})\subset V$, and $D_b:=\phi_b^{-1}(D\cap V)=\{\tau=\zeta+i\eta\in\phi_b^{-1}(V):\zeta+f_b(\eta)<0\}$;
– $\omega_b\le\omega$, where ω_b is the modulus of continuity of f_b' on $(-2s,2s)$.

Note that $\omega_*=\sup\omega_b$ is an subadditive function. Then its modulus of continuity does not exceed ω and hence ω_* is Dini-continuous. So, we may find a Dini-smooth domain G, symmetric with respect to the real axis, such that

$$D_*\cap s\mathbb{D}\subset G\subset D_*\cap 2s\mathbb{D}\subset D_b,$$

where $D_*=\{\tau\in\mathbb{C}:\zeta+\int_0^{|\eta|}w_*(t)dt<0\}$.

Note that there a conformal map $\theta:G\to\mathbb{D}$ which extends to a C^1-diffeomorphism from $\overline{G}$ to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ (cf. [7, Theorem 3.5]). We may assume that $\theta(G\cap\mathbb{R})=(-1,1)$.

Let now $2c_1\ge q>1$. Choose a ball U of radius $r\le\dfrac{s}{2c_1q^2+1}$ centered at a such that if $z\in D\cap U$, then $d_D(z)=|z-z'|$ for some $z'\in\partial D\cap V$. For $z,w\in D\cap U$ set

$$\tilde z=z+c_1q^2|z-w|n_{z'},\ \hat z=d_D(z),\ \check z=d_D(z)+c_1q^2|z-w|.$$

Then $\hat z,\check z\in G$ and $\phi_{z'}(\hat z)=z$, $\phi_{z'}(\check z)=\tilde z$. Hence

$$k_D(z,w)-k_D(\tilde z,\tilde w)\le k_D(z,\tilde z)+k_D(w,\tilde w)$$
$$\le k_G(\hat z,\check z)+k_G(\hat w,\check w)\le k_{\mathbb{D}}(\theta(\hat z),\theta(\check z))+k_{\mathbb{D}}(\theta(\hat w),\theta(\check w)).$$

Since

$$k_{\mathbb{D}}(\alpha,\beta)=\frac12\log\left(1+\frac{2(\alpha-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)(1+\beta)}\right),\quad -1<\beta\le\alpha<1,$$

$$\lim_{\nu\to0}\frac{d_{\mathbb{D}}(\theta(\nu))}{d_G(\nu)}=|\theta'(0)|,\quad \lim_{u\to a}\frac{d_G(\hat u)}{d_D(u)}=1,$$

we may shrink r such that

$$k_D(z,w)\le k_D(\tilde z,\tilde w)+\frac12\log\left(1+\frac{c_1q^3|z-w|}{d_D(z)}\right)\left(1+\frac{c_1q^3|z-w|}{d_D(z)}\right).\tag{3}$$

To estimate $k_D(\tilde z,\tilde w)$, we shrink r once more such that

$$|n_z-n_w|\le q-1,\ |\tilde z-z'|\le qd_D(\tilde z),\ |\tilde w-w'|\le qd_D(\tilde w).$$

Then

$$|\tilde{z}-\tilde{w}|\le q|z-w|<c_1^{-1}\min\{d_D(\tilde{z}),d_D(\tilde{w})\}\le d_D(\tilde{z})+d_D(\tilde{w}).$$

Choosing V convex, it follows that $[\tilde{z},\tilde{w}]\subset V$. By (1), we may shrink V such that

$$2\kappa_D(u;X)d_D(u)\le q|X|,\quad u\in D\cap V.$$

Now, we shall proceed as in the proof of [3, Lemma 2.1]. There is a point ϑ in the complex line through $\tilde{z}$ and $\tilde{w}$ such that $|\vartheta-\tilde{z}|=d_D(\tilde{z})$ and $|\vartheta-\tilde{w}|=d_D(\tilde{w})$. If $\gamma=[z,w]$, then

$$\frac{\tanh k_D(\tilde{z},\tilde{w})}{q}\le\tanh\frac{k_D(\tilde{z},\tilde{w})}{q}\le\tanh\int_\gamma\frac{|du|}{2d_D(u)}$$

$$\le\tanh\int_\gamma\frac{|du|}{2|u-\vartheta|}=\frac{|\tilde{z}-\tilde{w}|}{d_D(\tilde{z})+d_D(\tilde{w})}\le\frac{q^2|z-w|}{|\tilde{z}-z'|+|\tilde{w}-w'|}$$

$$=\frac{q^2|z-w|}{d_D(z)+d_D(w)+2c_1q^2|z-w|}\le\frac{q^3|z-w|}{d_D(z)+d_D(w)+2c_1q^3|z-w|}.$$

It follows from here and (3) that

$$2k_D(z,w)\le p_D(z,w,c_2):=\log\frac{g(c_2,\gamma,\delta)}{\gamma\delta},$$

where $c_2=c_1/q$, $\gamma=\dfrac{d_D(z)}{q^4|z-w|}$, $\delta=\dfrac{d_D(w)}{q^4|z-w|}$ $(z\ne w)$ and

$$g(\gamma,\delta,c_2)=(c_2+\gamma)(c_2+\delta)\frac{2c_2+1+\gamma+\delta}{2c_2-1+\gamma+\delta}.$$

Assume for a while that $p_D(z,w,c_2)\le v_D^c(z,w)$, where $c=\tilde{c}_0q^3$. This means that $g(\gamma,\delta,c_2)\le(\sqrt{\gamma\delta}+\tilde{c}_0)^2$. Letting $\gamma,\delta\to0$, we obtain

$$c_2\sqrt{\frac{2c_2+1}{2c_2-1}}\le\tilde{c}_0.$$

Letting $\gamma\to0, q\to1$ with $\delta=\gamma+q^4$, we get $c_2+1\le\tilde{c}_0$. Thus

$$\tilde{c}_0\ge\min_{c_2>1/2}\max\{c_2\sqrt{\frac{2c_2+1}{2c_2-1}},c_2+1\}=c_0$$

and $\tilde{c}_0=c_0\Leftrightarrow c_2=\sqrt{2}/2$.

Note now that

$$g(\gamma,\gamma+1,c_2)-g(\gamma,\delta,c_2)=\frac{\gamma+1-\delta}{2c_2-1+\gamma+\delta}(2c_2^2-1+3c_2\gamma+c_2\delta+\gamma^2+\gamma\delta).$$

Let $c_2\ge\sqrt{2}/2$. Since $\delta<\gamma+1$, it follows that

$$g(\gamma,\delta,c_2)<g(\gamma,\gamma+1,c_2)=(\gamma+c_2+1)^2.$$

So, $2k_D \le v_D^c$ on $(D\cap U)^2$, where $c = c_0 q^3$.

The result for h_D can be obtained in the same way. If $n = 1$, then $h_D = i_D \le v_D^1$.

Let $n \ge 2$. We may choose G to be convex which implies that $2d_G\kappa_G(\cdot;1) \ge 1$ and hence $2k_G \ge h_G$. Then we may proceed as above.

4. An application of Corollary 8

The next result is inspired by [2, Theorem 1.1] and [10, Theorem 4.1].

Proposition 12. *Let D be a Dini-smooth bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with a negative plurisubharmonic function $u_D \ge -d_D$.*[1] *Let G be a convex Dini-smooth bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\partial G \cap T_b^{\mathbb{C}}\partial G = \{b\}$ for any $b \in \partial G$. Then every proper holomorphic map $f : D \to G$ extends to a continuous map from $\overline{D}$ onto $\overline{G}$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then one may find sequences $(z_j^k)_j \subset D$ $(k = 1, 2)$ such that for $w_j^k = f(z_j^k)$,

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} z_j^k = a \in \partial D,\ \lim_{j\to\infty} w_j^k = b^k \in \partial G,\ b^1 \ne b^2,\ w_j^1 \ne w_j^2.$$

By [10, Lemma 3.5] and Corollary 8, there is a constant $c > c_0$ for which

$$-\log(cd_G(w_j^1)d_G(w_j^2)) < 2k_G(w_j^1, w_j^2) \le 2k_D(z_j^1, z_j^2) \le v_D^c(z_j^1, z_j^2).$$

On the other hand, $v(w) = \max\{u(z) : z \in f^{-1}(w)\}$ is a plurisubharmonic function on G. Since the Hopf lemma holds on G (cf. [9, Theorem 3.5]), we may increase c such that $d_G \circ f < -\sqrt{c}v \circ f \le \sqrt{c}d_D$. Then

$$1 < c\sqrt{d_D(z_j^1)d_D(z_j^2)} + c^2|z_j^1 - z_j^2|$$

which is impossible for any j large enough.

References

[1] O. Dovgoshey, P. Hariri, M. Vuorinen, *Comparison theorems for hyperbolic type metrics*, arXiv:1504.04487.

[2] F. Forstneric, J.-P. Rosay, *Localization ot the Kobayashi metric and the boundary continuity of proper holomorphic mappings*, Math. Ann. 279 (1987), 239–252.

[3] F.W. Gehring, K. Hag, O. Martio, *Quasihyperbolic geodesics in John domains*, Math. Scand. 65 (1989), 75–92.

[4] F.W. Gehring, B.G. Osgood, *Uniform domains and the quasi-hyperbolic metric*, J. Anal. Math. 36 (1979), 50–74.

[5] N. Nikolov, *Behavior of invariant metrics near convex boundary points*, Czech. Math. J. 53 (128), (2003), 1–7.

[1] If D is convex, then $u_D = -d_D$ works.

[6] N. Nikolov, P. Pflug, P.J. Thomas, *Upper bound for the Lempert function of smooth domains*, Math. Z. 266 (2010), 425–430.
[7] Ch. Pommerenke, *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*, Grundl. math. Wissensch. 299, Springer, Berlin (1992).
[8] M. Vuorinen, *Conformal geometry and quasiregular mappings*, Lecture Notes Math. 1319, Springer, Berlin (1988).
[9] K.-O. Widman, *Inequalities for the Green function and boundary continuity of the gradient of solutions of elliptic differential equations*, Math. Scand. 21 (1967), 17–37.
[10] A.M. Zimmer, *Characterizing polynomial domains by their automorphism group*, arXiv:1506.07852.

N. Nikolov: Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Acad. G. Bonchev 8, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
Faculty of Information Sciences, State University of Library Studies and Information Technologies, Shipchenski prohod 69A, 1574 Sofia, Bulgaria
E-mail address: nik@math.bas.bg

L. Andreev: Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Acad. G. Bonchev 8, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
E-mail address: lyubomir.andreev@math.bas.bg